

REMARKS

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-11 as the claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter. By the above amendments, Applicant has canceled claims 1-11 and added new claims 12-22 which generally correspond to the original claims 1-11 and now are directed to statutory subject matter and thus are considered to be acceptable under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

The Examiner has solely rejected claims 1-11 as being unpatentable over Eggleston. The Examiner has stated that while Eggleston lacks an explicit recital of the elements of claim 1, it would have been obvious to Eggleston to select such features. However, Applicant believes Eggleston does not describe the subject invention in which point information together with system information about a distributor of a commodity is sent to a center unit, and the center unit separately manages services to be provided to the user according to the system information added to the point information in association with the distributor of the commodity. With these features, the sales promotion can be performed separately according to each distributor of the commodity. The Examiner has also rejected dependent claims 2-11 based on the same rationale.

Applicant has amended the claims so that it now focuses on a promotion method comprising the steps of issuing point information, adding system information, sending point information to a center unit, receiving point information and then managing the services which are provided the user according to the system information and then providing the service to the user based on such information. Contrary to this, Eggleston teaches incentive programs which are administered without regard to products being purchased, distinctly different from the essential focus of Applicant's invention; in other words, under Applicant's invention, a user purchases a product, and point information related to the product determines the reward or service provided the user; whereas in Eggleston, there is set up a standard incentive program wherein rewards are provided based on either on-line testing, attendance, games of skill or chance, etc. and the rewards are selected by the user through coupons and discounts, etc. As a result, Eggleston, with his focus on achievement-based awards, does not teach or suggest Applicant's invention which is based on product purchases. Accordingly, Applicant believes claims 1-11 to be allowable as amended.

Applicant hereby requests reconsideration and re-examination thereof.

Serial No. : 10/044,696

With the above amendments and the remarks, this application is considered ready for allowance, and Applicants earnestly solicit an early notice of same. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Gerald T. Shekleton
Registration No. 27,466

Dated: September 2, 2004
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza
22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606-3913
Telephone: 312/655-1500